

## **REMARKS**

### **Status Of Application**

Claims 9-22, 25-27, 33-35, 37-41 and 56-59 are pending in the application; the status of the claims is as follows:

Claims 9, 11, 12, 19-22, 25, 27, 33, 37-41, 56, 58, and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,809,265 to Blair et al. ("Blair et al.").

Claims 14, 16, 17, 26, 34, and 35 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blair et al. in view of IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin, Vol. 36, No. 09B, September 1993 to Jackson et al. ("Jackson et al.").

Claims 10 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blair et al. as applied to claims 9, 11 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,996,029 to Sugiyama et al. ("Sugiyama et al.").

Claim 15 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blair et al. in view of Jackson et al. as applied to claims 14, 16 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,996,029 to Sugiyama et al. ("Sugiyama et al.").

Claim 57 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blair et al. as applied to claim 56 above, and further in view of Jackson et al.

The above rejections were affirmed on appeal in a Decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences issued June 18, 2008.

Claims 9-22, 25-27, 33-35, 37-41 and 56-59 are being canceled.

Claims 60-72 have been added.

An Information Disclosure Statement is being filed concurrently herewith.

**New Claims 60-72**

In contrast to the cited references, claim 60 includes:

displaying, when any function has not yet been selected, on the layout image icons of the plurality of input-output apparatuses representing the functions of the plurality of the input-output apparatuses, while, when the one function has been selected, displaying on the layout image icons of the selected functions to represent only the input-output apparatuses that have the selected functions; ...

As stated in the Findings of Fact in the Decision (Page 5), the cited references only categorize output devices by location:

3. The GUI presents the end user with a map of output devices within buildings and, more specifically, on floors and wings and within offices of the buildings. Employing a clicking device such as a mouse triggers a display of the name of the portion of the location under the mouse location (prior to clicking) and also creates a close up or localized wing or office section of the building (after clicking). The close up reveals buttons each of which represents the approximate location of the various selectable output devices within the wing or office selected. (Blair, col. 2., 11. 40-67, col. 4, ll. 46-60, Figs. 3-10).

The cited references do not show or suggest “when the one function has been selected, displaying on the layout image icons of the selected functions to represent only the input-output apparatuses that have the selected functions.” Therefore, claim 60 is patentably distinct from the prior art. Claim 61 is dependent upon claim 60, and thus is distinguished from the prior art for the same reasons.

Also in contrast to the cited references, claim 62 includes:

a controller for controlling the display to display, when any function has not yet been selected, on the layout image icons of the plurality of input-output apparatuses representing the functions of the plurality of the input-output apparatuses, while, when the one function has been selected,

displaying on the layout image icons of the selected functions to represent only the input-output apparatuses that have the selected functions ...

As noted above with regard to claim 60, these features are patentably distinct from the prior art.

Also in contrast to the cited references, claim 63 includes:

displaying, when any function has not yet been selected, on the layout image icons of the plurality of input-output apparatuses representing the functions of the plurality of the input-output apparatuses, while, when the one function has been selected, displaying on the layout image icons of the selected functions to represent only the input-output apparatuses that have the selected functions; ...

As noted above with regard to claim 60, these features are patentably distinct from the prior art.

Also in contrast to the cited references, claim 64 includes:

selectably displaying on the layout image only the input-output apparatuses that relate to the selected user; ...

The cited references do not show or suggest displaying “only the input-output apparatuses that relate to the selected user.” Therefore, claim 64 is patentably distinct from the prior art. Claim 65 is dependent upon claim 64, and thus is distinguished from the prior art for the same reasons.

Also in contrast to the cited references, claim 66 includes:

a controller for controlling the display to selectably displaying on the layout image names of users of the input-output apparatuses at the locations of the layout image that respectively correspond to actual locations of the users, and to selectably displaying on the layout image only the input-output apparatuses that relate to the selected user ...

As noted above with regard to claim 64, this feature is patentably distinct from the prior art.

Also in contrast to the cited references, claim 67 includes:

- (a) determining whether the image forming apparatus is capable of carrying out a job;
- (b) displaying icons on a layout image, the icons being for output apparatuses that are able to substitute for function(s) of the image forming apparatus to execute the job;
- (c) automatically selecting an output apparatus that substitutes the functions(s) of the image forming apparatus for the job;
- (d) distinguishably displaying the icons of the selected output apparatus from the icons of remaining ones of the output apparatuses on the layout image; and
- (e) allowing a user to select one of the icons corresponding to the remaining ones of the output apparatuses to alter the selected output apparatus; ...

As noted above with regard to claim 60, the cited references do not show or suggest displaying selected output apparatuses based on capability of the apparatuses. Therefore, claim 67 is patentably distinct from the prior art. Claims 68-70 are dependent upon claim 67, and thus are patentably distinct for the same reason.

Also in contrast to the cited references, claim 71 includes:

- (a) determining whether the image forming apparatus is capable of carrying out a job;
- (b) displaying, based on the table stored in the storage, icons on the layout image, the icons being for the output apparatuses that are able to substitute for function(s) of the image forming apparatus to execute the job;
- (c) automatically selecting an output apparatus that substitutes the functions(s) of the image forming apparatus for the job;
- (d) distinguishably displaying the icons of the selected output apparatus from the icons of remaining ones of the output apparatuses on the layout image; ...

As noted above with regard to claim 67, the cited references do not show or suggest displaying selected output apparatuses based on capability of the apparatuses. Therefore, claim 71 is patentably distinct from the prior art.

Also in contrast to the cited references, claim 72 includes:

- (a) determining whether the image forming apparatus is capable of carrying out a job;
- (b) displaying icons on a layout image, the icons being for output apparatuses that are able to substitute for function(s) of the image forming apparatus to execute the job;
- (c) automatically selecting an output apparatus that substitutes the functions(s) of the image forming apparatus for the job;
- (d) distinguishably displaying the icons of the selected output apparatus from the icons of remaining ones of the output apparatuses on the layout image; ...

As noted above with regard to claim 67, the cited references do not show or suggest displaying selected output apparatuses based on capability of the apparatuses. Therefore, claim 72 is patentably distinct from the prior art.

### **CONCLUSION**

Wherefore, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is considered to be in condition for allowance, and an early reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

This Amendment does not increase the number of independent claims, does not increase the total number of claims, and does not present any multiple dependency claims. Accordingly, no fee based on the number or type of claims is currently due. However, if a fee, other than the issue fee, is due, please charge this fee to Sidley Austin LLP Deposit Account No. 18-1260.

Application No. 09/082,127  
Amendment dated August 11, 2008  
Reply to Decision on Appeal of June 18, 2008

If an extension of time is required to enable this document to be timely filed and there is no separate Petition for Extension of Time filed herewith, this document is to be construed as also constituting a Petition for Extension of Time Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) for a period of time sufficient to enable this document to be timely filed.

Any other fee required for such Petition for Extension of Time and any other fee required by this document pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17, other than the issue fee, and not submitted herewith should be charged to Sidley Austin LLP Deposit Account No. 18-1260. Any refund should be credited to the same account.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Douglas A. Sorensen/ Reg. No. 31,570  
Douglas A. Sorensen  
Registration No. 31,570  
Attorney for Applicants

DAS/llb  
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP  
717 N. Harwood, Suite 3400  
Dallas, Texas 75201  
Direct: (214) 981-3482  
Main: (214) 981-3300  
Facsimile: (214) 981-3400  
August 11, 2008